UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/628,745	07/28/2003	Robert J. Bengtsson	02-0222	4048

74576 7590 09/30/2008

HUGH P. GORTLER
23 Arrivo Drive
Mission Viejo, CA 92692

EXAMINER	
STOKELY-COLLINS, JASMINE N	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2623	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/30/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/628,745	BENGTSSON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	JASMINE STOKELY-COLLINS	2623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *29 July 2008*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 8/13/2008 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed on 7/29/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

3. On page 6, last paragraph applicant argues that it would not have been obvious to add image editing software to Brady's IFE system to obtain the vehicle seat of claim 1. The examiner disagrees; Brady teaches an in flight entertainment system that includes a USB port for connecting a passenger's laptop to the IFE system. It is well known and widely practiced to include image editing software on laptop computers. However, to further bolster the assertion that it would be obvious to combine the functions of a laptop with the IFE system, the examiner cites US Patent 7,321,383 B2 to Monagahn et al which, in column 5 line 62-column 6 line 5, connects a laptop to an IFE system including a seat back mounted display and enables 2-way bidirectional data communication between the laptop and IFE server in order for the user to perform "a wide variety of tasks".

Claim Objections

4. Claim 2 is objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 2, line 2 "[the video monitor] is mounted on **a back of the seat back**" is redundant and unclear.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-5, 10-16 and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brady Jr. et al (US 7,114,171 B2) in view of Loui et al (US 6,813,618 B1).

Regarding claim 1, Brady teaches a vehicle seat for supporting a passenger of a vehicle (figure 1b), said seat comprising:

a seat frame (figure 1b);

a video monitor mounted on the seat frame (figure 1b element 650); and

a digital processor (LRU) operatively connected to the video monitor for processing a digital input for display as an image on the video monitor (column 9 lines 39-42).

While Brady teaches a passenger's laptop computer connecting to the in-flight entertainment system (col. 15 ll. 32-35), Brady does not mention image editing software for allowing a passenger to organize and edit any one or more images from the digital input.

Loui teaches software configured to organize and edit any one or more images from digital input into a digital photo album (col. 1 ll. 25-30, ll. 33-34, ll. 43-45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the software taught by Loui into the laptop connected to the LRU taught by Brady for the benefit of enabling airplane passengers to access the entertainment capabilities of a laptop computer while on a flight.

Regarding claim 2, when read in light of claim 1, Brady further teaches the video monitor is mounted on a back of the seat back for viewing from behind the vehicle seat (figure 1b element 650).

Regarding claim 3, when read in light of claim 1, Brady further teaches the digital processor includes an interface for connecting the processor to an external data source (column 15 lines 32-45).

Regarding claim 5, when read in light of claim 3, Brady further teaches the interface includes a universal serial bus (USB) port (column 15 lines 32-35).

Regarding claim 15, Brady further teaches said processor (LRU) is operatively connectable to a camera remote from the seat for providing digital input to the processor (column 11 lines 32-46, where the network server program coupled to the camera is shown as part of the LRU in figure 1a).

Regarding claim 18, Brady teaches an aircraft (abstract) comprising:
a fuselage having a passenger cabin (figure 2 suggests at least 2 passengers, column 5 lines 33-35 disclose a cabin);
a plurality of passenger seats mounted within the cabin (figure 1b), at least one of the of seats comprising:

a seat frame (figure 1b);

a video monitor mounted on the seat frame (figure 1b element 650); and

a digital processor (LRU)_operatively connected to the video monitor for processing a digital input for display as an image on the video monitor (column 9 lines 39-42).

While Brady teaches a passenger's laptop computer connecting to the in-flight entertainment system (col. 15 ll. 32-35), Brady does not mention image editing software for allowing a passenger to organize and edit any one or more images from the digital input.

Loui teaches software configured to organize and edit any one or more images from digital input into a digital photo album (col. 1 ll. 25-30, ll. 33-34, ll. 43-45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the software taught by Loui into the laptop connected to the LRU taught by Brady for the benefit of enabling airplane passengers to access the entertainment capabilities of a laptop computer while on a flight.

7. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brady Jr. et al (US 7,114,171 B2) in view of Loui et al (US 6,813,618 B1), and further in view of Monagahn et al (US 7,321,383 B2).

Regarding claim 4, when read in light of claim 1, Brady in view of Loui teaches the vehicle seat in accordance with claim 1.

While Brady in view of Loui teaches a laptop connected to the IFE system (Brady column 15 lines 32-45) wherein images from the passenger can be edited (Loiu col. 1 ll. 25-30, ll. 33-34, ll. 43-45), Brady in view of Loui does not teach the processor includes an interface for accepting digital images from a passenger.

Monagahn teaches an IFE system (col. 1 ll. 14-16) in which a passenger's laptop has bi-directional data communication with the IFE system (col. 5 ll. 62-col. 6 ll. 5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to enable bi-directional data communication in the

system taught by Brady in view of Loui for the benefit of enabling a user to perform a variety of tasks while on the flight.

Regarding claim 19, when read in light of claim 18, Brady in view of Loui teaches the vehicle seat in accordance with claim 18.

While Brady in view of Loui teaches a laptop connected to the IFE system (Brady column 15 lines 32-45) wherein images from the passenger can be edited (Loiu col. 1 ll. 25-30, ll. 33-34, ll. 43-45), Brady in view of Loui does not teach the processor includes an interface for accepting digital images from a passenger.

Monagahn teaches an IFE system (col. 1 ll. 14-16) in which a passenger's laptop has bi-directional data communication with the IFE system (col. 5 ll. 62-col. 6 ll. 5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to enable bi-directional data communication in the system taught by Brady in view of Loui for the benefit of enabling a user to perform a variety of tasks while on the flight.

Regarding claim 20, when read in light of claim 18, Brady in view of Loui teaches the vehicle seat of claim 18.

Brady in view of Loui does not teach mixing personal images with content provided by the aircraft. While Brady in view of Loui teaches a laptop connected to the IFE system (Brady column 15 lines 32-45) wherein images from the passenger can be edited (Loiu col. 1 ll. 25-30, ll. 33-34, ll. 43-45), Brady in view

of Loui does not teach bi-directional data communication between the laptop and IFE system.

Monagahn teaches an IFE system (col. 1 ll. 14-16) in which a passenger's laptop has bi-directional data communication with the IFE system (col. 5 ll. 62-col. 6 ll. 5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to enable bi-directional data communication in the system taught by Brady in view of Loui for the benefit of enabling a user to perform a variety of tasks while on the flight. This results in images from both the laptop and those provided by the IFE system residing in the same device (i.e. mixing personal images with content provided by the aircraft).

8. Claims 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brady Jr. et al (US 7,114,171 B2) in view of Loui et al (US 6,813,618 B1), and further in view of DeLorme et al (US 6,321,158 B1).

Regarding claim 6, when read in light of claim 1, Brady in view of Loui teaches the vehicle seat of claim 1. Brady in view of Loui does not teach said processor is configured to generate a digital travel album from said plurality of images.

DeLorme teaches a processor is configured to generate a digital travel album from one or more images (column 71 lines 36-44). DeLorme's invention creates the travel album using pictures associated with locations, and Loui

teaches manually editing and arranging pictures by location. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine DeLorme's teaching of creating a digital travel album by associating images with locations, with Loui's teaching of manually organizing photos by location to obtain a manually and/or automatically organized digital travel album by sorting images by location. The benefit of combining DeLorme with Brady in view of Loui is allowing a passenger to commemorate his travels with a digital travel album created from personal photos.

Regarding claim 7, when read in light of claim 6, DeLorme further teaches the one or more images includes digital images recorded from a digital camera (fig. 1a3 el. 13: digital camera). Additionally, Loui teaches obtaining digital material from a digital camera (col. 1 ll. 40-42).

9. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brady Jr. et al (US 7,114,171 B2) in view of Loui et al (US 6,813,618 B1) and DeLorme et al (US 6,321,158 B1), and further in view of Brunner JR (US 2002/0067424)

Regarding claim 8, when read in light of claim 7, Brady in view of Loui and DeLorme teach the vehicle seat of claim 7, whereby a passenger can edit digital images (see analysis of claims 1 and 7).

Brady in view of Loui and DeLorme does not teach digital images recorded from the digital camera include images captured from a digital camera mounted on the outer surface of an in-flight aircraft.

Brunner teaches a camera mounted on the outside of an aircraft that can be connected to an in-cabin display for passenger entertainment (abstract). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Brunner's teaching of an aircraft-mounted camera system for the benefit of providing in flight entertainment to cabin passengers by allowing them to have the same view as the pilot (pg. 1 sect. 0002).

10. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brady Jr. et al (US 7,114,171 B2) in view of Loui et al (US 6,813,618 B1) and DeLorme et al (US 6,321,158 B1), and further in view of Gluck (US 6,532,345 B1).

Regarding claim 9, when read in light of claim 6, Brady in view of Loui and DeLorme teach the vehicle seat of claim 7.

Brady in view of Loui and DeLorme does not teach said processor is configured to merge the one or more images into one digital image.

Gluck teaches merging images to make a single "photo-realistic sheet" using software (col. 6 ll. 21-23). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the photo

merging technique taught by Gluck into the in-flight entertainment photo editing software taught by Brady in view of Loui and DeLorme for the benefit of creating a photo souvenir that incorporates both the scene/event/location and the viewer when it is not possible to capture the viewer and the scene/event/location in the same shot at the time the picture was taken (col. 1 ll. 22-40).

9. Claims 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brady Jr. et al (US 7,114,171 B2) in view of Loui et al (US 6,813,618 B1), and further in view of Eichmann (US 6,947,071 B2).

Regarding claim 10, when read in light of claim 1, Brady in view of Loui teaches a vehicle seat in accordance with claim 1, further comprising a camera operatively connected to said processor (Brady's LRU) for providing digital input to the processor (Brady column 12 lines 44-46 disclose an input camera coupled to a audio/video controller. Column 10 lines 55-57 state the video controller is included in the LRU), whereby a passenger can edit digital images (see analysis of claim 1).

Brady does not disclose that camera is mounted on said seat frame.

Eichmann teaches a camera mounted to a front-seat back for viewing passengers in the rear-seat of a vehicle (column 8 lines 47-51). The use of a digital camera is inferred from column 4 lines 54-58, in which Eichmann suggests the devices which could be utilized for displaying the output from said camera.

One such capability of these devices is "playing digital video recordings", which requires the use of a digital recording device to acquire said video recordings. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the camera taught by Brady with the digital characteristic of Eichmann for the benefit of providing a clearer picture and to further provide a clear view of rear seat occupants for surveillance purposes.

Regarding claim 11, limitation "wherein the digital camera is mounted on the rear surface of the seat back for recording images of behind the vehicle seat" is further met by the combination of Brady in view of Loui and Eichmann. Eichmann teaches a camera mounted to the back of a front seat for viewing passengers in the rear-seat of a vehicle (column 8 lines 47-51).

10. Claims 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brady Jr. et al (US 7,114,171 B2) in view of Loui et al (US 6,813,618 B1), and further in view of Weinberger et al (US 6,813,777 B1).

Regarding claim 12, Brady in view of Loui teaches a vehicle seat in accordance with claim 1.

Brady in view of Loui does not teach a control device operatively connected to said processor for controlling operation of said processor.

Weinberger teaches a control device (figure 7d, on sheet 8 of the drawings) operatively connected to said processor for controlling operation of said processor (column 31 lines 43-49, where the audio-video unit Weinberger's controller interfaces with is analogous to the audio/video controller that Brady discloses as part of his LRU in column 10 lines 55-59 of his disclosure). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system taught by Brady to incorporate the remote controller taught by Weinberger for the benefit of a more convenient and comfortable control device for the user that would eliminate the need for the user to reach for a control interface situated farther away.

Regarding claim 13, when read in light of claim 12, Weinberger further teaches said control device comprises a remote control device (fig. 7d, on sheet 8 of the drawings) operatively connected to said processor by an electromagnetic signal (column 31 lines 43-64, where the audio-video unit Weinberger's controller interfaces with is analogous to the audio/video controller that Brady discloses as part of his LRU in column 10 lines 55-59 of his disclosure).

Regarding claim 17, when read in light of claim 1, Weinberger further teaches a processor operatively connectable to a transmitter for sending information output by the processor to a location remote from the vehicle. Weinberger teaches an in-flight entertainment system that allows voice and data

communication between passengers on-board an aircraft and people and computers on the ground (Col. 7 ll. 13-21). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the capabilities taught by Weinberger with the in-flight entertainment system taught by Brady in view of Loui for the benefit of allowing passengers to communicate with friends, family members, or business associates while on a flight.

11. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brady Jr. et al (US 7,114,171 B2) in view of Loui et al (US 6,813,618 B1), and further in view of Dittmann et al (US 5,239,376 A).

Regarding claim 14, Brady in view of Loui teaches a vehicle seat in accordance with Claim 1 as analyzed above.

Brady in view of Loui does not teach said processor is operatively connectable to a printer for printing images.

Dittmann teaches including a printer to print out still images captured by a surveillance camera (column 3 lines 14-18). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a printer with image-printing capabilities in the system taught by Brady for the benefit of producing a hardcopy of any images taken for any potential security breaches, or to have a record of passengers on a flight.

12. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brady Jr. et al (US 7,114,171 B2) in view of Loui et al (US 6,813,618 B1), and further in view of Rivera (US 2002/0124260 A1).

Regarding claim 16, Brady in view of Loui teaches a vehicle seat in accordance with Claim 15 as analyzed above.

Brady in view of Loui does not teach the camera is mounted on an exterior surface of the vehicle.

Rivera teaches a camera is mounted on an exterior surface of a vehicle (figure 2 element 14). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Rivera's teaching of mounting a camera on the outside of a vehicle with the airplane disclosed in Brady for the benefit of photographing weather conditions, or providing an expanded view of the airplane's surroundings for better navigation.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JASMINE STOKELY-COLLINS whose telephone number is (571) 270-3459. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 9:30-5:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Koenig can be reached on (571) 272-7296. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jasmine Stokely-Collins/
Examiner, Art Unit 2623

/Andrew Y Koenig/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2623